



## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,096	10/04/2000	Sol Aisenberg	EXC-0001	9651
23413	7590 06/03/2002			
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			EXAMINER	
	55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002		JEFFERY, JOHN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3742	
			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2002	14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/679096		
	Examiner Jeffen	Group Art. Unit	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence address—	
P riod for Reply	7		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE	
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state</li> </ul>	eply within the statutory minim, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror	num of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication .	
Status /	_ /		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	28/02	•	
☐ This action is FINAL.	<u>'</u>		
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193</li> </ul>			
Disposition of Claims		•	
$\chi$ Claim(s) $36-43$			
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
$\Box$ Claim(s) $36 - 43$	is/are rejected.		
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
□ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election requirement.		
Applicati n Papers			
☐ Se the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin	• • •		
☐ Th proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection.	is approved	disapproved.	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	ted to by the Examiner.	•	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	•	•	
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of □ received.</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb</li> <li>received in this national stage application from the Interest</li> </ul>			
*Certified copies not received:		•	
Attachment(s)			
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N	nt rvi w Summary, PTO-413		
☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94		Other	
Offic	e Action Summary		

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

3.17.00

; i.

Part of Paper N .\_\_\_\_\_

Serial Number: 09/679096

Art Unit: 3742

Claims 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In all claims, the limitation that the air jet "blows off at least 75% of the water from the hands in less than 3 seconds" is vague and indefinite since the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be reasonably ascertained. The limitation is necessarily dependent upon how much water is initially on the user's hands which inevitably varies from user to user; the limitation is therefore inherently uncertain. The same problem arises in connection with the limitation "when dried, said hands have less than 0.3 grams of water remaining on said hands."

Also, the limitation that the hands "do not cool due to evaporation of remaining water" is vague and indefinite for the above reasons.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 36-40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbertson (US4634839) in view of Tomaro (US4327278). Gilbertson (US4634839) discloses an electrically heated dryer with a blower for directing air via cylindrical nozzle 34. See Col. 1, lines 5-15. The claim differs from the previously cited prior art in calling for the blower to generate an air velocity of no less than 18,000 fpm. According to the instant specification on Page 17, lines 10-15, to achieve such an airflow rate, a motor that operates at greater than 15,000 rpm must be used. While the specific air velocity of the blower of the previously described apparatus is not recited, providing blowers which operate in excess of 15,000 rpm in electrically heated hair dryers is conventional and well known in the art as evidenced by Tomaro (US4327278) noting Col. 2, lines 55-57 wherein a blower motor with a loaded speed of 19,000 rpm is disclosed. In view of Tomaro (US4327278), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a blower motor in excess of 15,000 rpm in the previously described apparatus in order to increase the rotational rate of the blower thereby increase the heated airflow issuing therefrom. While motor rotation rate is not the only

Serial Number: 09/679096

Art Unit: 3742

parameter involved that affects airflow, it is a <u>substantial factor</u> in achieving a desired flow rate. This is evidenced by Applicant's point in the specification noting the criticality of the motor rpm value of greater than 15,000 rpm. Furthermore, it is well settled that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1955). Here, choosing the specific parameters of other factors influencing airflow rate such as fan blade size, angle, and the like to maximize the flow rate of aspirated air in a heated air blower is well within the parameters of routine experimentation. Furthermore, while the specific (1) outlet size, (2) outlet length, (3) air jet pressure, and (4) air jet temperature are not specified, choosing the optimum (1) dimensions for the outlet, (2) air jet pressure, and (3) air jet temperature to achieve a desired convective heating effect is well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art and would be the product of routine experimentation and optimization.

Claims 41 and 43 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Jeffery at telephone number (703) 306-4601 or fax (703) 305-3463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM EST. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

JOHN A. JEFFERY

PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/15/02